

App. Serial No.: 09/536,858
Atty. Docket No.: 0011-028C1

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated August 23, 2004, which has a shortened statutory period for response set to expire November 23, 2004. A one-month extension of time, to expire December 23, 2004, is requested in a petition filed herewith.

Claims

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-19 are rejected over prior art. Claims 9 and 17-19 are amended, and Claims 1-8 and 10-16 remain as filed. Reconsideration is requested.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-19 are rejected on grounds of nonstatutory double patenting. A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to obviate the double patenting rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Akiyama (USPN 5,952,991) in view of McKnight (USPN 6,225,991). Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Akiyama and McKnight as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Pinkham (USPN 6,518,945).

First Interview Summary

An interview was held between Applicants' attorney Larry E. Henneman, Jr. and Examiner Regina Liang, on November 15, 2004. Mr. Henneman requested clarification with respect to the proposed modification of the circuit of the primary reference to obtain Applicants' claimed invention and, also, how the pending claims were being read on the proposed modification. The Examiner did not provide any clarification. Further, contrary to Examiner Liang's assertion in the Interview Summary mailed November 23, 2004, Mr. Henneman did not present any arguments what so ever. Mr. Henneman did persist in his request for clarification. However, despite many attempts, Mr. Henneman was apparently unable to effectively communicate his request for clarification to Examiner Liang.

App. Serial No.: 09/536,858
Atty. Docket No.: 0011-028C1

Second Interview Summary

A second interview was held on December 17, 2004 between Examiner Henry Tran and Applicants' attorney Mr. Larry E. Henneman, Jr.. Applicants' acknowledge and appreciate the time and effort spent by Examiner Tran and the constructive assistance provided by Examiner Tran during the interview.

First, Examiner Tran and Mr. Henneman agreed that Applicants' invention was distinguished over the cited prior art, because according to Applicants' invention a data bit is used to control the assertion of voltages supplied by one of the two voltage supply terminals on the pixel electrode.

Second, Examiner Tran and Mr. Henneman discussed proposed amendments that would clarify the agreed upon distinction over the prior art. It was agreed that Claim 1 did not require any amendments to distinguish over the prior art of record. Further, specific amendments to Claims 9 and 17 were agreed upon to distinguish over the prior art of record.

Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a switch responsive to said data bit and operative to selectively couple said pixel electrode with one of said first voltage supply line and said second voltage supply line." (emphasis added) The cited references, when combined, do not teach or suggest this element of Claim 1.

Claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reason.

Claim 9:

As amended herein, Claim 9 recites, in part, "said switch asserts a voltage supplied by said first voltage supply terminal or a voltage supplied by said second voltage supply terminal on said output terminal responsive to a value of said data bit asserted on said control terminal." (emphasis added) The cited references, when combined, do not teach or suggest this element of amended Claim 9.

Claims 10-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 9 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reason.

App. Serial No.: 09/536,858
Atty. Docket No.: 0011-028C1

Claim 17:

As amended herein, Claim 17 recites, in part, "pixel means responsive to said data bit and operative to transmit said asserted predetermined voltages from one of said first supply terminal means and said second supply terminal means to said pixel electrode." (emphasis added) The cited references, when combined, do not teach or suggest this element of amended Claim 17.

Claims 18-19 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 17 and are, therefore, distinguished from the cited prior art for at least the same reason. Claims 18 and 19 are also amended so as to remain consistent with Claim 17, in view of the amendments to Claim 17.


Applicant hereby affirms that the amendments to Claims 9 and 17 made herein correspond word-for-word to the amendments agreed upon in the interview with Examiner Tran.

For the above reasons Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe Claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner undertake any action other than allowance of Claims 1-19, or if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions for expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at (269) 279-8820.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/23/04


Larry E. Henneman, Jr., Reg. No. 41,063
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Henneman & Saunders
714 W. Michigan Ave.
Three Rivers, MI 49093

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via facsimile, on the date shown below, to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, at (703) 872-9306.

Date: 12/23/04


Larry E. Henneman, Jr.